DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Clark-Bader, Inc. d/b/a
TMC Long Distance, Inc.,
Complainant,

v.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,
Defendant

CC Docket No. 93-101
File No. 46680-9 1993

To: Honorable Walter C. Miller Administrative Law Judge

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY TO COMMENTS OF THE COMMON CARRIER BUREAU

Complainant Clark-Bader, Inc. d/b/a TMC Long Distance ("TMC"), by its attorneys, hereby requests permission for leave to file a Reply to the "Comments of the Common Carrier Bureau" filed by the Enforcement Division of the Common Carrier Bureau ("Bureau") on August 2, 1993, in response to a "Petition for Clarification" filed by Defendant Pacific Bell Telephone Company ("PacBell") on July 15, 1993 ("Petition"). In support of this Motion, the following is shown.

1. PacBell's Petition requested the Presiding Judge clarify his ruling in the <u>Prehearing Order</u>, FCC 93M-426, released June 30, 1993 ("PHO"), which denied PacBell's request for witness immunity filed during the predesignation phase of this proceeding. PacBell's Petition was limited to a discussion of the proper standard applicable to a request for immunity from prosecution under FCC regulations, and a request that it be

permitted to renew its request for immunity at the prehearing conference scheduled for September 21, 1993.

In responding to PacBell's Petition, the Bureau did not confine its comments to the narrow procedural issue raised by Instead, the Bureau, without notice to TMC or the Presiding Judge, appears to be suggesting that an inquiry be undertaken into issues that have not heretofore been raised against TMC through a timely filed request for enlargement of The new matters raised by the Bureau not issues or otherwise. only propose a dramatic expansion of the scope of the relief requested by PacBell in its Petition, but also for the first time gratuitously interject without proper foundation serious issues As demonstrated in TMC's Reply of misconduct against TMC. attached hereto, such a broadening of the issues cannot be properly made in this manner. First, because these matters were raised for the first time in the Bureau's responsive Comments, TMC has not otherwise had an opportunity to address these matters Secondly, the proper means to raise any issues on the record. not designated by the Presiding Judge is via a timely filed request for enlargement of the issues.

As the proposed TMC Reply is limited exclusively to the new and prejudicial matters that have been raised by the Bureau without proper procedure having been followed, TMC respectfully requests that it be permitted to submit the accompanying Reply to

the Bureau's Comments, and that TMC's Reply be considered by the Presiding Judge in evaluating the matters raised for the first time in the Bureau's Comments.

Respectfully submitted,

d/b/e The Long/Distance

3// MOU

Charles H. Heldin Julia A. Waysdorf

Donald H. Manley Michael R. Carithers

Its Attorneys

GALLAND, KHARASCH, MORSE & GARFINKLE, P.C. 1054 31st Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 342-6795 (voice) (202) 342-5219 (facsimile)

Dated: August 9, 1993

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Suzanne Helein, hereby certify that on this 9th day of August, 1993, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing "Motion for Leave to File Reply to Comments of the Common Carrier Bureau" in CC Docket No. 93-161, File No. E-89-85, to be sent to the following in the manner indicated:

Via Facsimile and First Class Mail to:

James P. Tuthill, Esquire Nancy C. Woolf, Esquire Pacific Bell 140 New Montgomery Street Room 1530-A San Francisco, CA 94105

and by hand delivery to:

Thomas D. Wyatt, Esquire
Chief
Formal Complaints and Investigation
Branch
Federal Communications Commission
Room 107
1250 23rd Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Walter C. Miller Administrative Law Judge Federal Communications Commission Room 213 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

Suzanna Helein